

From Hubbard model to t-J-U model: a canonical transformation formalism, the metal-insulator transition and mean-field state

Yue Yu

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, P.O. Box 2735, Beijing 100080, China
(February 2, 2008)

We prove that the t-J-U model can be deduced from the Hubbard model at a large but finite U by a canonical transformation. We argue that the system may have a metal-insulator transition at a critical on-site Coulomb interaction whose value, however, is smaller than that in previous calculations in which the kinetic energy has a double counting. In a mean field theory and a special choice of the parameters, we show that the metallic state may be equivalent to the gossamer superconducting state proposed by Laughlin recently.

PACS numbers:74.20.-z,74.20.Mn,72.-h,71.10.Fd

The Hubbard model is the generic model for interacting electrons in the narrow-band and strongly correlated systems [1]. Especially, since the high temperature superconductivity was discovered in the cuprates, the Hubbard model on two-dimensional lattices as well as its strong coupling limit model [2], the t-J model, have been extensively studied in order to understand the various anomalous properties of the cuprate superconductor. The up-date investigations, however, can not supply a definitive evidence to show the stable d -wave superconducting ground state in these strongly correlated models [3].

It was known that while the Hubbard model is weaker in describing the exchange correlation, the t-J model is weaker in the long range charge correlation. A better phenomenological model to include stronger correlations is the t-J-U model [4]. The existence of both J- and U-terms is very important in a possible mechanism of the high T_c superconductivity, gossamer superconductivity, proposed by Laughlin recently [3,5,6]. Although including both J- and U- terms in the model Hamiltonian is physically reasonable for both the exchange interaction and the on-site Coulomb interaction are always relevant to the real systems, there is no a microscopic deduction of the t-J-U model from a generic model.

Comparing with the Hubbard model, there seems to be a double counting in the t-J-U model to the interacting or kinetic energies due to taking both the J- and U- terms into consideration simultaneously. All previous theories on the t-J-U model did not deal with this double counting since the lack of a microscopic understanding. In this paper, we would like to show that the t-J-U model in fact can be derived from the origin single-band Hubbard model in a large but finite U . The double counting in the previous phenomenological t-J-U model was in the kinetic energy as we will show. An easy understanding in fact can be seen by checking the perturbative deduction from the Hubbard model to the t-J model: The J-term is actually from the second order perturbation in t/U by taking the off-diagonal term for the double-occupied number in the kinetic term. Namely, if the t-term is decomposed into $T_{\text{diag}} + T_{\text{off-diag}}$, the perturbation process transfers $T_{\text{off-diag}}$ to J-term, a virtual hopping process,

and only T_{diag} serves as the real hopping. It can also clearly be seen from the canonical transformation deduction of the t-J model [7].

In this paper, we would like to deal with the Hubbard model in a large but finite on-site Coulomb interaction by using the canonical transformation. We find that the effective Hamiltonian can be written as the sum over the Hamiltonians acting on a subspace of the Hilbert space with a fixed double occupied number. In a partial Gutzwiller projection, we examine the variational ground of the effective Hamiltonian using the Gutzwiller approximation. A metal-insulator transition is found at a critical U_c which however is lower than that estimated by Zhang [5]. The overestimate of U_c in the previous works stems from the double counting of the kinetic energy in the phenomenological t-J-U model.

Our model is $U(1)$ -invariant due to the particle number conservation. If we consider a mean field state with the symmetry breaking, we can show that the mean field state with a special choice of the parameters is equivalent to Laughlin's gossamer superconducting state [3].

We start from the Hubbard model where the hopping energy may be dependent on the occupation of sites involved [8]. Including the on-site Coulomb interaction, this Hubbard model reads

$$H = T + V = T + U \sum_{i=1}^M \nu_i, \quad (1)$$

where M is the number of the site; $\nu_i = n_{i\uparrow}n_{i\downarrow}$, $n_{i\sigma} = c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma}$ with $c_{i\sigma}$ a spin- σ electron annihilation operator at site i and the kinetic term is given by

$$\begin{aligned} T &= T_h + T_d + T_{\text{mix}}, \\ T_h &= - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} t_{ij}^h (1 - n_{i\bar{\sigma}}) c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} (1 - n_{j\bar{\sigma}}), \\ T_d &= - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} t_{ij}^d n_{i\bar{\sigma}} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} n_{j\bar{\sigma}}, \\ T_{\text{mix}} &= - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} t_{ij}^{\text{mix}} n_{i\bar{\sigma}} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} (1 - n_{j\bar{\sigma}}) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

$$-\sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} t_{ij}^{mix} (1 - n_{i\bar{\sigma}}) c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} n_{j\bar{\sigma}}.$$

Except in the mean field theory, we assume $t_{ij}^h = t_{ij}^d = t_{ij}^{mix} = t$ for the nearest neighbor sites and vanish otherwise.

In order to define the canonical transformation, we explain our notations. The partial Gutzwiller projection operator

$$\Pi(g) = \prod_i (1 - (1 - g)\nu_i) = \sum_{D=0}^{N/2} g^D P_D = g^{\hat{D}}, \quad (3)$$

where $0 \leq g \leq 1$ is the Gutzwiller parameters; N is the electron number [9], $\hat{D} = \sum_i \nu_i$ and $P_D = \sum_{\{i_1, \dots, i_D\}} [\nu_{i_1} \dots \nu_{i_D} \prod_j' (1 - \nu_j)]$ is a projection operator which projects a state into the subspace with a fixed double-occupation number D . $P_0 = \Pi(0)$ is the full Gutzwiller projection operator and $\Pi(1) = 1$. For convenience, we denote $P_D(g) = g^D P_D$, $P_{\eta_i}(g) = \sum_{D \geq i} P_D(g)$.

The first goal of this work is to construct an effective Hamiltonian H_{eff} and after the partial Gutzwiller projection, the projected effective Hamiltonian is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(g) H_{\text{eff}} \Pi(g) &= \sum_D P_D(g) H_{\text{eff}} P_D(g) \\ &= \sum_D g^{2D} P_D H_{\text{eff}} P_D, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

i.e., all the off-diagonal part $P_{D'}(g) H_{\text{eff}} P_D(g) = 0$ for $D' \neq D$. We shall prove that the result effective Hamiltonian in which all terms keep D -invariance is given by

$$H_{\text{eff}} = T_h + T_d + \mathcal{J} + V, \quad (5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &= \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} (\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j - \frac{1}{4} n_{i\uparrow} n_{j\downarrow} - \frac{1}{2} n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} n_{j\downarrow}) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} n_{i\downarrow} n_{j\uparrow} n_{j\downarrow} + n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} n_{j\uparrow} n_{j\downarrow}), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

with $J_{ij} = J \approx 4t^2/U$ for a larger U .

The canonical transformation for the Hubbard model to the t-J model was introduced by Hirsh [7]. A detailed review for the canonical transformation can be found in Ref. [10]. Our derivation is a generalization of Hirsh's $D = 0$ case. Notice that $P_D T_{\text{mix}} P_{D'} = \delta_{D', D \pm 1} P_D T_{\text{mix}} P_{D \pm 1}$ and (5) remains D invariant, as well as $\Pi(g)\Pi(g') = \Pi(gg')$, $P_{\eta_D}(g)P_{\eta_D}(g') = P_{\eta_D}(gg')$. Keeping these in mind, we do a partial projection $\Pi(x)H\Pi(x)$ with $x = g^{2/N}$. For large N , x is very close to 1. A straightforward calculation leads to a rewriting of $\Pi(x)H\Pi(x)$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(x)H\Pi(x) &= H_0(x) + H_\eta^{(1)}(x), \\ H_0(x) &= H_{\text{diag}}(x) + \sum_{D=2} H_\eta^{(D)}(x), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\text{diag}}(x) &= \sum_{D=0} P_D(x) H P_D(x), \\ H_\eta^{(D)}(x) &= P_{D-1}(x) T P_D(x) + P_D(x) T P_{D-1}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The purpose of the canonical transformation is to acquire an effective Hamiltonian $H_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}$ such that $P_0 H_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} P_D = P_D H_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} P_0 = 0$ for $D \neq 0$. This $H_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}$ is defined by

$$H_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} = e^{iS^{(1)}} \Pi(x) H \Pi(x) e^{-iS^{(1)}}. \quad (9)$$

As well-known [7,10], $S^{(1)}$ is determined by the self-consistent condition $iH_\eta^{(1)}(x) + [H_0(x), S^{(1)}] = 0$ and thus the effective Hamiltonian reads

$$H_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} = H_0(x) + \frac{i}{2} [S^{(1)}, H_\eta^{(1)}(x)]. \quad (10)$$

Solving the self-consistent condition, $H_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}$ in a large U is given by [7,10]

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 H_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} P_0 &\approx P_0 H P_0 - \frac{1}{U} P_0 H P_{\eta_1} H P_0 \\ &\approx P_0 H_{\text{eff}} P_0, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$P_{\eta_1}(x) H_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} P_{\eta_1}(x) \approx P_{\eta_1}(x^2) H P_{\eta_1}(x^2). \quad (12)$$

From the middle to the right sides in (11), the three site processes are neglected. If the non-double occupied constraint is imposed, (12) vanishes because it is related to the double occupation. Eq.(11) gives rise to the common t-J model. However, if the double occupation is allowed, we have to deal with (12). In fact, one can repeat the canonical transformation to (12). We would like to require an effective Hamiltonian $H_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}$ whose off-diagonal part $P_1 H_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} P_D = P_D H_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} P_1 = 0$ for $D > 1$. For this purpose, one writes

$$\Pi(x) H_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} \Pi(x) = P_0 H_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} P_0 + \tilde{H}_0(x^2) + H_\eta^{(2)}(x^2), \quad (13)$$

where $\tilde{H}_0(x^2) = P_1(x^2) H P_1(x^2) + P_{\eta_2}(x^2) H P_{\eta_2}(x^2)$. We do a canonical transformation and define

$$H_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} = e^{iS^{(2)}} \Pi(x) H_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} \Pi(x) e^{-iS^{(2)}}, \quad (14)$$

where $S^{(2)}$ is required to satisfy $P_0 S^{(2)} = S^{(2)} P_0 = 0$ such that $P_0 \Pi(x) H_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} \Pi(x) P_0$ is invariant under the transformation and it is self-consistently determined by $iH_\eta^{(2)}(x^2) + [\tilde{H}_0(x^2), S^{(2)}] = 0$. Hence, similar to (10), one has

$$H_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} = P_0 H_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} P_0 + \tilde{H}_0(x^2) + \frac{i}{2} [S^{(2)}, H_\eta^{(2)}(x^2)]. \quad (15)$$

Projecting $H_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} \rightarrow \Pi(x) H_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} \Pi(x)$ and repeating the similar procedure to deduce (11) and (12), one arrives at

$$\begin{aligned}
P_0 H_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} P_0 &\approx P_0 H_{\text{eff}} P_0, \\
P_1(x) H_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} P_1(x) &\approx x^2 P_1 H_{\text{eff}} P_1, \\
P_{\eta_2}(x) H_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} P_{\eta_2}(x) &\approx P_{\eta_2}(x^3) H P_{\eta_2}(x^3),
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

for a large U , where the three site processes have been ignored.

Repeating this procedure, we finally have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi(x) H_{\text{eff}}^{(\frac{N}{2})} \Pi(x) &= \sum_{D=0} g^{2D} P_D H_{\text{eff}} P_D \\
&= \Pi(g) H_{\text{eff}} \Pi(g).
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

The last equality is because H_{eff} is D -invariant. The Gutzwiller parameter is g but not x because we are doing the partial projection in each time canonical transformation. Thus, we end the proof of (4) and (5). Moreover, we see that, in a partial Gutzwiller projection, the variational ground state energy is given by a polynomial of the Gutzwiller parameter g in power of $2D$. The coefficient of g^{2D} -term is the ground state energy of the system with a fixed D . Using g as a variational parameter may be convenient for the numerical simulations. Since a larger U will be considered, the optimal value of g is expected to be much less than 1. Thus, it may be enough to calculate only a few terms of the polynomial in the energy. The numerical work for this model is in progress by using a variational Monte Carlo simulation [11]. In this work, we are going to discuss an infinite system by the Gutzwiller approximation [12]. The variational energy per site is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon &= \frac{\langle \psi_0 | \Pi(g) H_{\text{eff}} \Pi(g) | \psi_0 \rangle}{M \langle \psi_0 | \Pi(g) \Pi(g) | \psi_0 \rangle} \\
&= U d + \langle (T_h + T_d) \rangle + \langle \mathcal{J} \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Here $d = \frac{\sum_D g^{2D} D/M}{\sum_D g^{2D}}$ is the double occupied concentration. Using d as the variational parameter, Zhang has discussed the metal-insulator transition at a critical U_c for an effective Hubbard model (or the phenomenological t-J-U model) [5]. As we have mentioned, the Hamiltonian used in his paper overestimated the kinetic energy, comparing with our microscopic derivation of the t-J-U model. Meanwhile, we will see that the critical value of U_c estimated in [5] is higher than that we present here. Taking the approximation $\sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \nu_i n_j \approx 4Dn$ and neglecting the $\nu_i \nu_j$ term in (5), the variational condition is very simple

$$U_{\text{eff}} + \frac{\partial g'_t}{\partial d} \langle T \rangle_0 + \frac{\partial g_J}{\partial d} \langle J_{ex} \rangle_0 = 0. \tag{19}$$

here, J_{ex} is the $\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j$ term in the Hamiltonian; $U_{\text{eff}} = U - 4Jn$ because the contribution from $\nu_i n_j$ term in (5) and g'_t is modified from the original Gutzwiller factor g_t because of the absence of T_{mix} . g_J is the same as that in the projected Fermi liquid state [12]. We have, in fact,

$$\begin{aligned}
g_J &= \frac{4(1-\delta-2d)^2}{(1+\delta)^2(1-\delta)^2}, \\
g'_t &= \frac{2(1-\delta-2d)}{1+\delta} \left[\frac{\delta+d}{1-\delta} + \frac{d(1-\delta)}{(1+\delta)^2} \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

while $g_t = \frac{8d(1-\delta-2d)}{(1-\delta^2)(1+\delta)^2}$, where $\delta = 1 - n$. At half filling, $\delta = 0$ and it is easy to see $g'_t = 4d(1-2d) = g_t/2$. Hence, at half filling, the critical point of the metal-insulator transition is at $U_c = -4\langle T \rangle_0 + 16\langle J_{ex} \rangle_0 + 4J$. Using $\langle T \rangle_0 \approx -2\sqrt{2}tC$ and $\langle J_{ex} \rangle_0 \approx -(3/4)JC^2$ with $C \approx 0.479$ [5], $U_c = 5.4t + 1.25J$. This estimate for the critical point is much less than $U_c^{\text{ph}} = 10.8t - 2.75J$ which was given by Zhang [5]. For example, if $J \sim 0.4t$, $U_c \sim 5.9t < U$, while in Ref. [5] the estimate value $U_c^{\text{ph}} \sim 10.1t$. If one estimates $J \approx 4t^2/U$, $U \sim 10t$ which is near U_c^{ph} but larger than U_c . This means that for such parameters J and U , the system is in an absolute insulator state in our theory but is near the critical point in the phenomenological model. If $J \sim 0.67t$ (corresponding to $U \sim 6t$), $U_c \sim 6.2t$ is near U , while in Ref. [5] the estimate value $U_c^{\text{ph}} \sim 9.0t > U$. In this case, the system is near the critical point in our theory but in an absolute metal state in the phenomenological model. Although the quantitative value of U_c needs to be refined by numerical calculations, the conclusion $U_c < U_c^{\text{ph}}$ will not change.

We now are going to discuss the mean field state of our theory. The basic idea to go this mean field state has been explained in our previous preprint [13], although there were some computational errors in that paper. Here we present a renewed version of the mean field state. Introducing two correlation functions $\Delta_{ij} = \langle c_{i\downarrow} c_{j\uparrow} - c_{i\uparrow} c_{j\downarrow} \rangle_0$, $\chi_{ij} = \langle c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j\uparrow} + c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger c_{j\downarrow} \rangle_0$, the $U(1)$ symmetry of H_{eff} is broken by a decomposition of the four particle terms [13]. According to Δ_{ij} and χ_{ij} , the mean field Hamiltonian of (5) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\text{MF}} &= - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} (t_{ij}^h + t_{ij}^{(1)} (n_{i\bar{\sigma}} + n_{j\bar{\sigma}}) + t_{ij}^{(2)} n_{i\bar{\sigma}} n_{j\bar{\sigma}}) c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} \\
&\quad + \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} (J_{ij} + J_{ij}^{(1)} (n_{i\sigma} + n_{j\sigma}) + J_{ij}^{(2)} n_{i\sigma} n_{j\sigma}) \\
&\quad \times (-1)^\sigma (\Delta_{ij}^\dagger c_{i\sigma} c_{j\bar{\sigma}} + \Delta_{ij} c_{j\bar{\sigma}}^\dagger c_{i\sigma}^\dagger) \\
&\quad + U \sum_i n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} 2J_{ij} (1-A) n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} \\
&\quad - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} (A |\Delta_{ij}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} (1-B) |\chi_{ij}|^2) (n_i + n_j) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} J_{ij} (\frac{A}{2} |\Delta_{ij}|^2 n_{i\sigma} n_{j\bar{\sigma}} + \frac{1-B}{2} |\chi_{ij}|^2 n_{i\sigma} n_{j\sigma}),
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where the parameters are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{ij}^{(1)} &= \frac{A}{2} J_{ij}, \quad J_{ij}^{(2)} = -\frac{B}{2} J_{ij}, \\
t_{ij}^{(1)} &= -t_{ij}^h - (1-A) \chi_{ji} J_{ij},
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

$$t_{ij}^{(2)} = t_{ij}^h + t_{ij}^d - (1 - B)\chi_{ji}J_{ij}.$$

A and B are the variational parameters to be determined. On the other hand, we write down Laughlin's gossamer superconducting Hamiltonian

$$H_G - \mu_R N = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} E_{\mathbf{k}} \tilde{b}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger \tilde{b}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}, \quad (23)$$

where μ_R is renormalized chemical potential, $E_{\mathbf{k}} = \sqrt{(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \mu_R)^2 + \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^2}$ and $\tilde{b}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} = \Pi(g)b_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}\Pi^{-1}(g)$ for $b_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow} = u_{\mathbf{k}}c_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow} + v_{\mathbf{k}}c_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow}^\dagger$ and $b_{\mathbf{k}\downarrow} = u_{\mathbf{k}}c_{\mathbf{k}\downarrow} - v_{\mathbf{k}}c_{-\mathbf{k}\uparrow}^\dagger$ annihilate the BCS state. Expressing explicitly (23) by the electron operators [13,6], we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_G - \mu_R N = & - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} [t_{ij}^G + t_{ij}^{G(1)}(n_{i\bar{\sigma}} + n_{j\bar{\sigma}}) \\ & + t_{ij}^{G(2)}n_{i\bar{\sigma}}n_{j\bar{\sigma}}] + \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} J_{ij} [1 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha\beta(n_{i\bar{\sigma}} + n_{j\bar{\sigma}}) \\ & - \alpha\beta n_{i\bar{\sigma}}n_{j\bar{\sigma}}](-1)^\sigma (\Delta_{ij}^\dagger c_{i\sigma} c_{j\bar{\sigma}} + \Delta_{ij} c_{j\bar{\sigma}}^\dagger c_{i\sigma}^\dagger) \\ & + U_G \sum_i n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} - \mu_G N \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where $\alpha = 1 - g$ and $\beta = (1 - g)/g$ and

$$\begin{aligned} t_{ij}^G &= t_{ij}^h, \\ t_{ij}^{G(1)} &= - \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{E_{\mathbf{k}}}{M} (\alpha v_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + \beta u_{\mathbf{k}}^2) e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)} \\ t_{ij}^{G(2)} &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{E_{\mathbf{k}}}{M} (\alpha^2 v_{\mathbf{k}}^2 - \beta^2 u_{\mathbf{k}}^2) e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)}, \\ J_{ij} \Delta_{ij} &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{E_{\mathbf{k}}}{M} u_{\mathbf{k}} v_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

and $U_G = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} E_{\mathbf{k}} [(2\beta + \beta^2)u_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + (2\alpha - \alpha^2)v_{\mathbf{k}}^2]$, $\mu_G = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} E_{\mathbf{k}} [(2\alpha + 1)v_{\mathbf{k}}^2 - u_{\mathbf{k}}^2]$. If we identify the t-J-U model to the gossamer superconducting model in the mean field level, one requires

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \alpha\beta, \quad B = 2\alpha\beta, \\ t_{ij}^{G(1)} &= -t_{ij}^h - (1 - \alpha\beta)\chi_{ji}J_{ij}, \\ t_{ij}^{G(2)} &= t_{ij}^h + t_{ij}^d - (1 - 2\alpha\beta)\chi_{ji}J_{ij}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

and $\mu_R + \mu_G = J(12A|\Delta_\tau|^2 + 8(1 - B)|\chi_\tau|^2) + \mu$, $U = U_G + 8J(1 - A)$.

Although we have made a formal equivalence between our mean field state Hamiltonian to Laughlin gossamer superconducting Hamiltonian, we note that the hopping parameters $t^{G(1,2)}$ have run out of the practical range in the real materials. Thus, to show the system described by the t-J-U model has a gossamer superconducting phase described by Laughlin gossamer superconducting Hamiltonian, a renormalization group analysis is required. We do not touch this aspect in this work. However, we can

believe there is such a superconducting phase in our theory if $U < U_c$ because the superconducting pairing parameter is determined by the optimal exchange energy as in the common t-J model. The renormalization of the hopping parameters is believed to affect the normal dissipation process only.

In conclusions, we have deduced a t-J-U model from the Hubbard model at a large but finite U by a series of canonical transformations. This microscopic derivation showed the overestimate to the kinetic energy in previous work by a phenomenological t-J-U model. We then saw that the critical U_c for the metal-insulator transition is much lower than the value calculated by the phenomenological model. Through a mean field theory, we showed that the gossamer superconducting state may possibly be a symmetry breaking state of the t-J-U model as the BCS common superconducting state versus the Fermi liquid. Another advantage of our t-J-U model is that the energy was decomposed into the summation over the energies with the fixed D . This is convenient for numerical simulation.

The author was grateful for the useful discussions to Jingyu Gan, Jinbin Li, Zhaobin Su, Yuchuan Wen, Tao Xiang, Lu Yu and F. C. Zhang. This work was supported in part by the NSF of China.

-
- [1] J. Hubbard, Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A **276** 238 (1963).
 - [2] P. W. Anderson, Science **235**, 1196(1987). F. C. Zhang and T. M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 3759 (1988).
 - [3] See, R. B. Laughlin, E-preprint: cond-mat/0209269 and references therein.
 - [4] T. C. Hua, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 11379 (1990). S. Daul, D. J. Scalapino, and S. R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4188 (2000). E. Plekhanov, S. Sorella, and M. Fabrizio, E-preprint: cond-mat/0210169.
 - [5] F. C. Zhang, E-preprint: cond-mat/0209272.
 - [6] B. A. Bernevig, R. B. Laughlin, D. I. Santiago, E-preprint: cond-mat/0303045.
 - [7] J. Hirsh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 1317 (1985).
 - [8] See, e.g., L. Arrachea, A. A. Aligia, and E. R. Gagliano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 4396 (1996) and references therein.
 - [9] The summation over D runs from 1 to M in general. However, for a fixed particle number N , the highest number of the double occupied sites is $N/2$.
 - [10] A. P. Balachandran, E. Ercolessi, G. Morandi and A. M. Srivastava, Intl. J. Mod. Phys. B **4**, 2057(1990).
 - [11] Yu-Chuan Wen and Yue Yu, in preparation.
 - [12] M. C. Gutzwiller, Phys. Rev. **137**, A1726 (1965); D. Vollhardt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **56**, 99 (1984).
 - [13] Yue Yu, E-preprint: cond-mat/0211131.